Independent Quality Assurance Assessment
of the
Washington State Provider Payroll Project

Monthly Quality Assurance Assessment

Document Number SL-010-040208
Rev 4.0

Prepared for:

Washington State
Provider Payroll Project

Prepared by:

216 Sixteenth Street
Suite 700
Denver, CO 80202
Voice: 303.575.6881
Web: www.systest.com

4/2/2008

REVISION HISTORY

Rev	Date	Change	Author
1.0	03/27/2008	Initial Draft for internal review	LeAnne Dolce
2.0	03/31/2008	Draft for Provider Payroll Project review	LeAnne Dolce
3.0	04/01/2008	Input from the Project Manager was considered.	LeAnne Dolce
4.0	04/02/2008	Final Assessment Version with revisions to the Findings and Recommendations.	LeAnne Dolce

SysTest
labs®

4/2/2008   Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 2 of 27

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SysTest
labs*

4/2/2008   Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 3 of 27

TABLES

Project Name	Provider Payroll Project
Project Sponsor	Blake Chard, Deputy Secretary
Provider Payroll Project Manager	Jacqui Boydston, PMP
SysTest Labs Quality Assurance Assessment Manager	LeAnne Dolce
SysTest Labs Independent Verification and Validation team	Joseph Goolsby – IV&V Lead Andrew Riley – IV&V Specialist
Reporting Period	01-March-2008 through 31-March-2008

1   OBJECTIVES OF THE INDEPENDENT QA ASSESSMENT REPORT

The State Of Washington requires high-risk information technology projects, such as the Provider Payroll Project, to obtain independent Quality Assurance (QA) services throughout the life of the project. The Department Of Social and Health Services (DSHS) has a adopted a quality management framework for IT projects that are assessed as high risk and has contracted with SysTest Labs to act in an independent overview and assessment role.

The objective of this independent quality assurance assessment report is to provide the State's sponsor, key executives, project team, and other stakeholders with an independent assessment and status of the project's quality assurance and project management activities in the following areas:

> *Project Phase*

> *Project Sponsorship and Executive Support*

> *Project Management and organizational Structure*

> *Project Management Plans*

> *Project Schedule and Work Plan Activities*

> *Project Staffing Plans*

> *Vendor Personnel Resource Monitoring*

> *Project Reporting*

> *Requirements Management*

QA obtained the information in this report through interviews with project personnel, reviews and analysis of project and state documentation, and participation in project meetings.

2   QA ASSESSMENT DASHBOARD

Quality Assurance Overall Project Assessment Phase 2: Request for Proposals			
Quality	Schedule	Scope	Budget
⬆	➡	⬆	⬆

Overall Quality Assessment Legend	
⬆	QA finds no risk to successful project completion
➡	QA finds potential risk to successful project completion
⬇	QA finds significant risk to successful project completion

Quality Assurance Category Assessment	
Category	**Rating**
Project Sponsorship and Exec Support	⬆
Project Mgmt and Org Structure	➡
Project Management Plans	⬇
Project Schedule and Work Plan Activities	⬆
Project Staffing Plan	⬇
Vendor Personnel Resource Monitoring	⬆
Project Reporting	⬆
Requirements Management	⬇
Feasibility Study	⬆

Category Status Legend	
⬆	No open findings for this category
➡	Category has one or more open findings with a Low rating
⬇	Category has one or more open findings with a High rating

Quality Assurance Findings Statistics	
Total # of Findings	19
Total # of Closed Findings	2
# of Open Findings with High Ratings	7
# of Open Findings with Low Ratings	10
# of Findings Opened this Assessment Period	1
# of Findings Closed this Assessment Period	0

2.1 Accomplishments during current assessment period:

- Revision of QA interview process for April/May to include SMEs around specific task areas (procurement, requirements definition)
- Outlined QA tasks for interim period prior to Phase 2 inception.

2.2 Plans for upcoming assessment period:

- Begin building a framework for requirements definition task
- Begin research of the state procurement process
- Begin detailed report on impact of requirements definition process/RFP development timeframe.

SysTest
labs

4/2/2008

Document Number SL-010-040208

This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.

Page 6 of 27

3 PROJECT PHASE

The Provider Payroll Project consists of four phases:

Phase	Start Date	End Date
Phase 1 – Feasibility Study	05/24/07	03/31/08
Phase 2 – Request for Proposal	Projected June 2008	TBD
Phase 3 – Procure Solution and/or Service and Obtain Approvals	TBD	TBD
Phase 4 – Design, Develop and Implement the Solution and/or Service	TBD	TBD

The Provider Payroll Project successfully completed Phase 1 – Feasibility Study on March 31, 2008 and is now entering the interim period before Phase 2 – Request for Proposal begins (June).

3.1 QA Assessment Summary

For the current reporting period, there was 1 new QA finding/recommendation. This recommendation (QA finding QA016) centers around the concern that the RFQQ (the State's third attempt to procure contract resources to develop the RFP) will return low quality or no bids. Section 8 – Project Staffing Plans describes the finding in more detail.

To ensure that QA deliverables remain proactive and efficient, the focus of the QA assessments during the interim period will shift to provide more details around the recommendations with highest impact:

- Build a framework for the requirements definition task
- Prepare a report of the impact of requesting the implementation team to research requirements, and write the RFP in 2.5 months.

Preparation for QA and Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V) involvement in Phase 2 – RFP and Phase 3 – Procurement activities will begin during the interim period. In preparation for the optional Phase 2 procurement process assessments, the QA Manager will be researching the state procurement process and preparing for QA participation. The QA Manager will also be working with the Provider Payroll Project Manager to refine the QA and IV&V tasks for the optional Phases 2 and 3 deliverables. Appendix C – Quality Assurance Deliverables documents the QA/IV&V deliverables.

SysTest
labs®

4/2/2008
Document Number SL-010-040208

This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.

Page 7 of 27

Recommendation Summary

SysTest Labs has formatted the findings and recommendations contained in the QA Findings Log in keeping with our methodology for assessing software development processes. QA reviews the findings with the Provider Payroll Project Manager on a monthly basis and notes DSHS actions in the log.

The findings contained in the final reports are made by SysTest Labs as an independent Quality Assurance consultant and are not to be viewed as mandates or as part of the project's work plan. DSHS should view the findings and their associated recommendations as tools that may be incorporated into the project planning process. QA recommends a course of action [designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of the project] and it is the project sponsors and stakeholders responsibilities to set expectations and drive the project by reacting to the findings.

A total of 19 QA findings have been opened during the life of the Project. Of the 17 open findings, 4 are joint QA/IV&V findings. There was 1 new finding with a high rating opened this assessment period. There are 7 open findings with a high rating and 10 open findings with a low rating. With the closure of Phase 1 on March 31, 2008, 13 of the 17 open findings have been deferred to be addressed by the Implementation Project Manager.

No findings were closed during this assessment period. The total number of closed findings is 2 and can be reviewed in Appendix A. Table 1 contains the complete list of findings with a high rating. The QA Findings and Recommendations Tracking Log includes the complete list of QA findings.

4/2/2008   Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 8 of 27

Table 1. QA Findings with a High Rating

ID Numbers beginning with "IQ" denote findings identified by both Quality Assurance and IV&V teams. For a complete list of findings, please reference Appendix A. Items highlighted in yellow are new findings for this reporting period. Closed findings will roll off this report the month after they are closed.

ID No.	Category	Date Opened	Phase Opened	Rating	Topic: Finding	Status	Assigned To	Recommendation	Impact	Assignee Actions
IQ001	Requirements Management	10/3/2007	P1-FS	High	**A large amount of discovery work will need to occur prior to RFP development**	Open	DSHS Vendor	The requirements will need to be re-baselined with technical and functional input from the SSPS team members. Technical requirements will need to be developed in conjunction with all technological partners (i.e. - ISSD, DIS, ESB, etc…) This finding will be closed when the requirements have been re-baselined.	The RFP will contain inaccurate or missing requirements. In addition, impacts the accuracy of the cost estimates.	02/27/08 - LD: the Implementation Project Manager being procured by the RFQQ created by Sue Langen will address this finding. Expect to have new team members on board June 2008. ------------------ 1/30/08 - LD: procurement request reposted by 2/1/08. Evaluation of responses to begin about 2/20. ------------------ 1/11/08 - LD: received two responses to the procurement requests. One for each request. Conducting interviews and checking references. Expect a decision by 1/25/08. ------------------ 12-12-07: LD: posted procurement request on 12/6/07. ------------------ 11-20-07 - LD: procuring resource to complete requirements. Including SSPS team members in requirements management for technical knowledge transfer.
IQ002	Requirements Management	10/3/2007	P1-FS	High	**SSPS Retirement: Planning for the retirement of Payroll functionality on the SSPS system should begin concurrent with RFP development**	Open	DSHS	The complex process required for retiring the current Payroll functionality of the SSPS system should begin concurrent to RFP development and be well documented This finding will be closed when the approach has been well defined and the documented.	If the DDI Vendor will need to participate in the retirement of the Payroll functionality of the SSPS system then that information needs to be included in the RFP, additionally the complex process of retiring only a piece	02/27/08 - LD: This finding will be addressed by the Implementation Project Manager being procured by the RFQQ created by Sue Langen. Expect to have new team members onboard June 2008. The enterprise issue was taken to the Executive Leadership Team on 2/26/08

S y s T e s t
labs®

ID No.	Category	Date Opened	Phase Opened	Rating	Topic: Finding	Status	Assigned To	Recommendation	Impact	Assignee Actions
									of the SSPS system will require large amounts of planning	for decision. Approval was received to move forward with the interface to SSPS. ------------------ 1/11/08 - LD: have an issue that they are tracking against. Has taken recommendation to PP Steering Committee and P1 steering committee. Has gone to the lower levels and now will be pushed to the DSHS executive level for review and approval. Expect to have resolution by the end of January. ----------------------- 12-12-07 LD: Recommendation will go to ELT for final decision. Date not determined yet. ----------------------- 11-20-07: Implementation Strategy meeting scheduled for 11/28/07. Issues have been raised on DSHS enterprise log and the Provider Payroll Project Manager's log
IQ003	Requirements Management	10/3/2007	P1-FS	High	**Requirements: DSHS should independently trace the requirements through the lifecycle of the project**	Open	DSHSVendor	A mechanism for requirements traceability should be implemented by DSHS and managed by the technical lead of the project.Traceability requirements will be added to the ASP vendor contract. The vendor will be required to document their traceability practices (for requirements through to testing) as part of the contract.This finding will be closed when the vendor provides their traceability plan to DSHS and the requirements have been officially handed off to the ASP Vendor. IV&V can be used as the checksum to	During the initial stage of the project it will allow DSHS to manage the requirements gathering process, further in the project it will allow DSHS to independently validate that all requirements have been met by the development effort and tested thoroughly	02/27/08 - LD: This finding will be addressed by the Implementation Project Manager (work performed by the Business Analyst) being procured by the RFQQ created by Sue Langen. Expect to have new team members onboard June 2008.- ------------------1/11/08 - received requirements management plan from FamLink project. Will get from P1 project as well to have a couple of resources available.- ----------------------11-20-07: This will be included within the overall process developed for requirements management

ID No.	Category	Date Opened	Phase Opened	Rating	Topic: Finding	Status	Assigned To	Recommendation	Impact	Assignee Actions
								ensure the Vendor is performing as required.		
IQ004	Requirements Management	10/23/2007	P1-FS	High	**DSHS should perform a risk assessment on legacy SSPS system**	Open	DSHS	Perform risk analysis on SSPS to determine: - If it is feasible to decommission a unique piece of functionality or if the system must be decommissioned as a whole - If decommissioning a unique piece of functionality will impact other applications running on the system - If the system will need to be shut down for any period of time to decommission the payroll functionality - The total level of effort to develop new code - The total level of integration between the payroll functionality and the other applications running on the SSPS system (which will not be decommissioned until after implementation of Provider One Phase II – Social Service Billing and Payment (SSBP)) General transition strategy ------------------------ Updated 12/13/07 Document should include: * what functionality is currently in SSPS * What functionality will be moved to ProviderOne * How will that functionality be decommissioned in SSPS * Timeframe and requirements necessary to complete decommissions * Risks/Impacts associated	Knowledge of impact that decommissioning the Provider Payroll functionality will have on other applications or other SSPS functionality. Clear understanding of the complete LOE for decommission and integration with new solution.	02/27/08 - LD: This finding will be addressed by the Implementation Project Manager (Technical Lead) being procured by the RFQQ created by Sue Langen. Expect to have new team members onboard June 2008. ------------------- 1/11/08 - LD: possibly Technical Lead will be the point person for this area. Implemenation PM will play a big part in deciding who leads this effort. ---------------------- 11-20-07 - LD: PM has requested additional information from SysTest Labs with regard to who should complete the Risk Analysis and what that should include.

ID No.	Category	Date Opened	Phase Opened	Rating	Topic: Finding	Status	Assigned To	Recommendation	Impact	Assignee Actions
								with decommissioning functionality in SSPS. * Mitigation strategies *Ranking of risks * probability of risk occurring * Costs associated with the risk. A good template I saw was available on Microsoft templates website: Risk Assessment and Financial Impact Model This finding will be closed when a Risk Assessment has been baselined.		
QA001	Requirements Management	10/3/2007	P1-FS	High	**Requirements: At the initiation of the RFP phase, DSHS should develop and implement a process for the identification and documentation of requirements**	Open	DSHS	A requirements management process should be implemented and all functional requirements should be managed in-house by DSHS.During the interim period before the start of the RFP phase, a process should be established and implemented to identify • stakeholders and business analysts from all affected areas• business practices, rules, and processes• functional and technical requirements to a level detailed enough for the creation of a thorough and complete RFP.• Required system interfaces, state and union requirements, system complexities that are unique from a standard payroll system. The requirements management process should be utilized to re-baseline the business and functional requirements for the RFP Phase.This finding will be closed when the	Managing requirements in-house will allow easier requirements management, change management, and traceability, and validation that all requirements are satisfied in RFP and subsequent implementation phases.A process to identify and document all requirements will assure that all of the unique requirements of the system are documented and included in the RFP.Higher quality requirements will provide a more accurate estimate COTS customization split. This directly results in a more accurate accounting for final cost of new system.	02/27/08 - LD: This finding will be addressed by the Implementation Project Manager (Business Analyst) being procured by the RFQQ created by Sue Langen. Expect to have new team members onboard June 2008.------------------1/11/08 - LD: process still has not been defined. Will work on process when contractors are brought on board.----------------------11-20-07: Process has not been put in place yet.

ID No.	Category	Date Opened	Phase Opened	Rating	Topic: Finding	Status	Assigned To	Recommendation	Impact	Assignee Actions
								Requirements Management Plan (either a separate document or incorporated into the Project Plan) has been baselined.		
QA014	Project Management Plans	2/22/2008	P1-FS	High	**Develop Meta Project Plan that covers activities of Provider Payroll, ProviderOne, and SSPS.**	Open	DSHS	A Meta project plan should be created that documents the interdependencies of the PP and the P1 projects (and any additional systems that will have developmental impacts). Should include the following information at a minimum: - Integrated Project Milestones - Requirements Dependencies - Resource Dependencies - Deliverable Dependencies - Identification of additional impacted systems - Integrated Roles and Responsibilities - Identification of who will manage this meta project/plan - Communication Matrix identifying situations and communication strategies for major project changes This finding will be closed out when the Meta Project Plan is baselined.	Rollout and implementation of Provider Payroll is more defined based upon the outside requirements such as interfacing with SSPS and Phase 2 schedule of ProviderOne.	03/26/08 - LD: the PPPM along with the CIO and ISSD PMO have begun discussions and the creation of a framework for addressing this recommendation. Discussions center around who will own this task (Provider Payroll Project or handled by an independent third party (ISSD PMO). --------------------------------- 02/27/08 - LD: There are informal efforts currently underway by JB. JB is currently evaluating whether to start a formal process now or wait until the Implementation PM is onboard to establish the formal process. The Implementation PM would be responsible for finalizing any processes started by the current PM.
QA016	Project Staffing Plan	3/13/2008	P1-FS	High	**Develop a strategy for the procurement process to determine the potential quality and quantity of intended bidders early in the process**	Open	DSHS	A strategy should be implemented that allows the project team to determine (early in the RFQQ and RFP processes) the quantity and the quality of potential bidders. This should include a mitigation plan that can be implemented BEFORE the bidding cycle ends should	Implementation of a strategy early in the RFQQ and RFP processes provides the project team with a plan of action if the bidders are not satisfactory or nonexistent. Failure to plan proactively can result in further	04/01/08 - LD: Jacqui Boydston informed that Central Contracts has received 4 letters of intent (2 received were from companies in this line of business).--------- --------------------------------- 03/26/08 - LD: Rob St. John informed the QA manager that potential bidders request was added to the RFQQ. This

SysTest
labs®

ID No.	Category	Date Opened	Phase Opened	Rating	Topic: Finding	Status	Assigned To	Recommendation	Impact	Assignee Actions
								the indicators show that no or low quality bidders are forthcoming.This finding will be closed out when the mitigation strategy has been documented and baselined. This mitigation strategy should cover the RFQQ and the RFP processes.	schedule slips, quality issues with the requirements,as well as stakeholder and team member involvement issues as they are pulled into other active projects and away from this project.	requests that potential bidders notify the team of their intention to bid. The RFQQ was submitted to Central Contract Services for release on 3/17/08. Also stated that additional mitigation plans are being developed to cover the case if no bids or low quality bids are received.

4/2/2008

SysTest
labs®

Document Number SL-010-040208

This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.

Page 14 of 27

4 PROJECT SPONSORSHIP AND EXECUTIVE SUPPORT

Table 2. Status and Progress Reports provided to Executive Leadership Team
The following table contains the status and progress reports that the Provider Payroll has forwarded to the project sponsor and key executives during this reporting period. The final column contains the QA assessment of accuracy and level of detail contained in the report.

Communication Type	Date Of Report	Sent By	Description
Project Status Reports	03/05/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager - Jacqui Boydston	Status reports display accomplishments for the current reporting period; plans for the next reporting period; track deliverables and milestone status; monitor budget; and track major issues, risks, and action items. The reports are accurate and contain the appropriate amount of detail for the intended audience.
Executive Steering Committee Meeting Agenda	03/13/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager - Jacqui Boydston	Agenda for the Executive Steering Committee meeting including expected outcomes for each discussion item and estimated discussion times.
Executive Steering Committee Meeting Minutes	03/17/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager - Jacqui Boydston	Minutes accurately report the meeting attendees, agenda items, discussion outcomes, and actions items with assignee listed (when appropriate).

Table 3. Meetings Attended by the Project Sponsor and Key Executives
The following table displays the meetings and presentations attended by the project sponsor and key executives during this reporting period, the accuracy of the information presented, and the sponsor's and key executive's participation in the meeting and reaction to the information presented.

Meeting	Meeting Date	Presented By	Accuracy Of Information Presented	Sponsor Participation and Reaction To Presentations
Executive Steering Committee Meeting	03/13/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager - Jacqui Boydston	All updates and project information presented is accurate and complete for this phase of the project.	All ESC members were in attendance this month. The conversation was very lively and centered around proactive approaches to mitigating project risks. Reaction to ESC debriefing was very positive and resulted in additional dialogue around QA014 – Meta Project.

4.1 Executive Support and Participation

As noted in previous reports, executive support and participation remains high and is critical to project success. There are no concerns at this time.

4.2 Project Governance

During this assessment period, the Project Manager provided an official change request to the Executive Steering Committee members to modify the scope and schedule of the Feasibility Study Project. The request included removing the RFP, the RFP requirements, and the APD development (Phase 2 deliverables) from the current project scope and officially closing Phase 1 – Feasibility Study by March 31, 2008. The change request also included documentation of tasks that will be completed during the interim period before Phase 2 begins and the budget savings that would be realized. After discussion with the ESC members, the Project Manager requested approval. Informal approval was received from ESC members. As previously documented in finding QA008, a more formal approval process is requested where quorum is confirmed and each stakeholder provides verbal or email approval that is captured in the meeting minutes. Enforcing a formal approval process ensures that each required stakeholder approves the deliverable or requested change/activity.

5 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

5.1 Organizational and Reporting Structure

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning the effectiveness of the project's organizational structure, reporting structure, and managerial oversight of the project.

The ISSD management team is currently establishing a Project Management Office and is in the final stages of interviews for a PMO Manager. The focus of the new PMO will be to establish standard methodologies, practices, and templates, and to track progress of all ISSD managed projects. The establishment of a division PMO is an essential step in maturing the project management capabilities and workforce. While not directly applicable to this project, this maturation will assist in decreasing the high dependence that the state currently has on contract PM resources to manage highly complex level 3 projects in the future.

5.2 Project Management Methodologies and Implementation

The section details the observations, risks, and recommendations concerning the effectiveness of the project management methodologies and processes; implementation of the project plans; decision-making and oversight of processes; and partnerships with key stakeholders and other organizations.

The project management methodologies currently in practice on the Provider Payroll Project are very well organized. Interview respondents have unanimously expressed their confidence in the project management of the project and have no issues.

There are no concerns with project management methodologies and implementation at this time. As the Implementation Project team is brought on board, the establishment of new project planning documentation that is in line with the ISSD PMO methodologies and standards will be increasingly important.

SysTest
labs®

4/2/2008
Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 16 of 27

6 PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLANS

6.1 Project Management Plans

Project Management Plans are routinely monitored to verify that the project plans have been documented and approved and any modifications to the plans during this reporting period have been documented and communicated to the project team and stakeholders. The effectiveness of the project plans for the management and execution of the project throughout its lifecycle are regularly monitored and reported.

Table 4. Project Management Plan Modifications During Reporting Period
The following table displays modifications made to the project management plan during this reporting period, the date of the modification, a summary of the modification made, who is affected, and communication to the proper stakeholders.

Date Of Change	Project Plan	Summary Of Change	Affected Party(s)	Change Communicated To Stakeholders
N/A		No changes are being made to the current project management plan.		

The Provider Payroll Project Manager has deferred all changes to the project management plan to the Implementation Project team. The Implementation Project team will create a new project plan when they officially roll onto the project (projected for June 2008). The Project Manager is reviewing the current documentation to determine what will be moved to the new SharePoint site. If the Feasibility Study Project Management Plan is not moved to the new SharePoint site, it will still be made available as reference material for the Implementation Project team.

The project planning documents created by the Implementation Project team will be included in the QA review process to ensure consistency with ISSD PMO methodologies and practices. There are no concerns at this time.

6.2 Project Risk Management

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning the effectiveness of the project's risk and issue management methodologies, procedures, and activities.

Table 5. Provider Payroll Risks Identified by Project Team
The following table contains the risks identified by the project team. Risks are documented and maintained by the Provider Payroll Project Manager. The Risk Log is kept on the project shared drive and will be incorporated into the new team SharePoint site located at: (http://ishare.dshs.wa.lcl/Enterprise/PMO/Projects/PP/default.aspx). The log includes the date the risk was identified, the risk priority, a brief summary of the risk, and mitigation strategies. The Provider Payroll Project Manager follows up on each risk and escalates to the Executive Steering Committee as needed.

No	Date	Prob 1, 2 or 3	Sev 1, 2 or 3	Exp	Risk Description	Consequence or Impact of Risk	Mitigation
8	12/06/07	3.0	2.5	7.5	Resource Availability: The RFP requirements work will begin at the end of January, early February. The leg will be in session, it will be tax season, CBA work will be underway, and P1 User	Staff targeted to work on the requirements may not be available.	• Schedule meetings as far in advance as possible. • Schedule small work groups as much as possible to be flexible. • Escalate conflicts to

No	Date	Prob 1, 2 or 3	Sev 1, 2 or 3	Exp	Risk Description	Consequence or Impact of Risk	Mitigation
					Acceptance Testing is scheduled to be underway.		management if progress is impeded. • Hire backfill for SMEs ASAP if FTEs are approved in the supplemental budget. This risk will carry forward to the Implementation Project
10	02/20/08	1	3	3	A second attempt was made to hire contracted resources for the RFP requirements, RFP and APD. No proposals were received. We will request these resources with the RFQQ for the Implementation Project Team. This may also be unsuccessful.	Additional time will need to be spent acquiring contracted resources and the scheduled will continue to slide.	• Removed RFP development from the Feasibility Study scope. • Requested these resources with the RFQQ for the Implementation Project Team.

6.3 Budget Control and Tracking

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning the processes and mechanisms for control and tracking of the project's budget.

There are no issues or concerns with the control and tracking of the budget and no recommendations for improvement. The budget for Phase 1 – Feasibility Study was closed out with the conclusion of Phase 1 on March 31, 2008 within the original budget measures.

The budget allocated from the legislature ($1.5 million) will be used for Project Planning efforts in Phase 2 – Request for Proposal and for Phase 3 - Procurement. This will carry the Implementation Project team through June of 2009 when the funding cycle for the next biennium begins. At this time, the team will return to the legislature to request additional funding to complete Phase 4 – Design, Development, and Implementation. Future QA assessments will include more detailed explanations of this process as they are defined.

The Project team is also in the process of laying the groundwork with CMS (for submittal of the APD). This foundational work will ensure CMS is aware of the project and the intent to submit the APD during Phase 2. The APD will be written by the Implementation Project team. The APD approval is required for the Provider Payroll Project to utilize the federal matching funds allocated to the project.

7 PROJECT SCHEDULE AND WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES

Table 6. Milestone Completion and Monitoring During Reporting Period
The following table displays the milestones scheduled for completion during this reporting period, the date completed, and (if necessary), the reason the milestone completion date was missed and the new scheduled completion date.

Milestone	original Scheduled Completion Date	Completion Date or Status	New Scheduled Completion Date	Comments or Explanation
Phase 1 – Feasibility Study complete	12/17/2007	03/31/2008	N/A	Approved re-baselined schedule has Phase 1 ending by March 31, 2008.
DSHS RFQQ Issued	03/18/2008	03/18/2008	N/A	RFQQ was issued by Central Contract Services
RFQQ Bidder's Letter of Intent due	03/28/2008	03/28/2008	N/A	The Letter of Intent is requested, not a mandatory submission for RFQQ bidders.
RFQQ Bidder Written Questions Due	03/25/2008	03/25/2008	N/A	Bidders are able to submit written questions about the RFQQ to DSHS.
DSHS Response to RFQQ Bidder Questions due	03/31/2008	03/31/2008	N/A	DSHS will issue a written response to the bidder questions **on or about** March 31, 2008.

Table 7. Milestones Scheduled for Completion During Next Reporting Period
The following table displays the milestones scheduled for the next reporting period and any identified problems, issues, or risks that may prevent the successful completion of the milestone.

Milestone	Scheduled Completion Date	Problems, Issues, and/or Risks To Completion
RFQQ Proposal Due Date	04/08/2008	No documented issues.
DSHS Evaluation of RFQQ Proposals	04/16/2008	No documented issues.
RFQQ Bidder Oral Presentations	04/23/2008	No documented issues.

Central Contract Services issued the RFQQ on March 18, 2008. The milestones listed above were extracted from the Procurement Schedule within the RFQQ. The RFQQ is available online at: http://www1.dshs.wa.gov/pdf/ms/ccs/RFQQ0834-311doc.pdf.

SysTest
labs®

7.1 Work Breakdown Structure, Work Plans, and Schedule Monitoring

The following constitutes the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning modifications to the work breakdown structure, evaluation of the project schedules and work plans, and verification that schedule variances are monitored, analyzed, reported, and addressed.

Table 8. Scheduled Deliverables Completed During Reporting Period

Deliverable	Scheduled Delivery Date	Actual Delivery Date	Comments
N/A			

Table 9. Known Schedule Variances Identified During Reporting Period

Schedule Variance	Scheduled Delivery Date	New Delivery Date	Reason For Variance
N/A			

7.2 Resource Utilization Monitoring

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning the processes used for managing resource utilization concerning project progress and possible impacts to the schedule, and to verify the availability of the designated resources with the correct skill sets when required.

There are no concerns with resource utilization monitoring at this time. There is an ongoing risk documented by the project team (Risk #8) that will be addressed by the Implementation Project team. For the interim period prior to Phase 2 work beginning, the resources necessary to complete the project tasks are sufficient and managed well.

Future assessments will be looking more deeply into resource utilization monitoring as the Implementation Project team is brought on board and requirements definition work begins.

8 PROJECT STAFFING PLAN

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning the job assignments, skills, experience and training of project personnel, the evaluation of hiring and procurement plans, and the use of sub-contractors or other external sources for specific project tasks.

The RFQQ was successfully submitted to the Contracts Office for release on Tuesday, March 18, 2008. Project interview respondents have continued to express concern that this RFQQ may not produce viable candidates due to the recent funding shortage provided by the legislature. QA finding QA016 recommends that a strategy be implemented to determine (early in the RFQQ process) the quality and quantity of potential bidders. The DSHS CIO and Deputy CIO have began addressing this finding by adding wording to the RFQQ to request notification from potential bidders. To date, 4 letters of intent have been received for the RFQQ. The next step for addressing this finding will be to develop and implement a strategy if no or low quality bids are submitted. This activity is currently underway by the Project Management team.

For the next assessment period, the QA Manager will be researching the procurement process to gain a full understanding of the process and how it is implemented for the Provider Payroll Project. This will include identifying and interviewing state personnel. Initial interviews are scheduled with Andrew Kramer (Central Contract Services RFQQ Coordinator) and Najib Younis (Central Contract Services Contracts Manager) for the next assessment period.

9 VENDOR PERSONNEL RESOURCE MONITORING

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning the ability of contracted vendors to provide and maintain the necessary staff with the required skill set and experience, at the specified time in the project, and for the specified duration.

There are no issues or concerns with vendor personnel resource monitoring and no recommendations for improvement at this time. During the RFQQ response evaluation period, the QA Manager will be invited to sit in during the written response evaluations and will provide recommendations on possible questions to ask during the oral interviews. QA Manager participation in the oral interview process is not required at this time.

10 PROJECT REPORTING

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning the use of project metrics, the processes for status reporting, review of status reports, and periodic interviews with project team members and stakeholders.

During the interim period before Phase 2 begins, A revised interview and reporting strategy will be implemented. Interviews scheduled and conducted during the interim period will be directly related to the QA assessment activities listed below. This will include the addition of additional Subject Matter Experts not previously included in interview sessions.

- Build a framework for the requirements definition task
- Research and understand the procurement process
- Prepare a report on the requirements definition timeline impact

The QA Assessment reports over the next two months will build out these activities into full recommendations for the State.

11 REQUIREMENTS MANAGEMENT

The following constitute the issues, risks, and recommendations concerning requirements identification, analysis, management, traceability, and change control.

11.1 Planning and Management

During the interim period before the Implementation Project team comes on board, the QA Manager will be working to build a framework for the requirements definition task, which includes:

S y s T e s t
labs

4/2/2008   Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 21 of 27

- Researching, prioritizing and categorizing the functional areas that the requirements definition task will address
- Listing the steps necessary to pinpoint the requirements gaps
- Interviewing the personnel that will be involved in the requirements definition process to ensure customer requirements are being gathered/documented
- Verifying that all impacted administrations/departments/systems are adequately represented in the planning efforts
- Verifying the strategy for incorporating and assessing Union requirements in the process

This framework will be provided to the State as a "checklist" for determining the quality of the Requirements Definition process and deliverables provided by the Implementation Project team.

11.2 Quality and Traceability

There are no issues or concerns at this time. The requirements definition framework will include recommendations for quality and traceability best practices for the requirements definition task (State traceability practices from Business to Technical requirements).

12 PHASE 2 ARTIFACTS

12.1 RFP and APD

There are no issues or concerns at this time. The PM is currently engaging in discussions with HRSA management to determine the best process and timeframe for submitting the Feasibility Study to the CMS team as part of the APD approval process. The APD approval is a necessary and required step in the funding requirements for the project to continue to move forward.

12.2 Procurement Strategy

During the interim period prior to Phase 2, QA interviews with State personnel from the Contracts office (Andrew Kramer and Najib Younis) will be conducted to gain a full understanding of the State procurement strategy to prepare for QA involvement in the Procurement Phase of the project.

13 MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS, RISKS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Interview respondents have continued to express concern in the following areas. QA findings and project actions have been included to document risk mitigation activities currently in place.

SysTest
labs®

4/2/2008
Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 22 of 27

- Lack of adequate legislative funding may result in viable vendors not bidding on the project. This includes the Implementation Project Team and the ASP vendor. This concern is being addressed by finding QA016.
- Coordination efforts a month the inter-dependent projects (PP, P1, SSPS, etc.) to ensure the projects are all on the same page and dependencies are well managed and documented. This concern is being addressed by finding QA014.
- Management of Union expectations including reactions to project direction/solution and the possibility of additional Unions coming on board. The project Steward held meetings with the Labor Relations Office to provide an update on the project and received favorable responses to the approach and the solution. Discussions are currently under way to determine how Union requirements will be captured and integrated into the Requirements Definition activities.
- Project involvement/momentum waning over time if the project is not actively engaged in work activities and/or meeting on a regular basis. The Project Manager has outlined the various tasks that will occur during the interim period prior to Phase 2 beginning. This includes regular updated to the project team and keeping the scheduled meetings on team member calendars to keep the time reserved.

SysTest
labs®

4/2/2008   Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 23 of 27

Appendix A. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING SHEET

The Findings and Recommendations Tracking Sheet is provided in a separate attachment entitled 20080401_DSHS_Provider_Payroll-WAIVVQA_Findings.xls.

Appendix B. INTERVIEW LIST

Table 10. Interviews Conducted This Assessment Period

Interviewee	Interview Date/Time	Title	Admin & Division/Office
Executive Steering Committee			
Jann Hoppler	03/14/08 1:30pm	Director	CA – Finance & Ops Support Division
Rob St. John	03/26/08 11:30am	CIO	ISSD
Stan Marshburn	03/26/08 9:30am	CFO	FSA
Core Team			
Fran Wilson-Maudsley	03/04/08 1:30pm	Office Chief	MSA – ASD/SSPS
Jacqui Boydston	Weekly Discussions	Project Manager	ISSD
Linda Lunsford	3/12/08 2:30pm	Program Manager	ADSA – DDD
Subject Matter Experts			
Brian Coolidge	3/13/08 2:00pm	Implementation Manager	HRSA – ProviderOne
Gena Cruciani	3/13/08 1:30pm	Deputy Project Manager	HRSA – ProviderOne

Appendix C. QUALITY ASSURANCE DELIVERABLES

Table 11. Quality Assurance Deliverables for Phase1 and Phase 2
Dates in italics are scheduled due dates.

Deliverable	Phase Due	Scheduled/Actual Completion	Description
Quality Assurance Plan and Approach	Phase 1	10/17/07	Outline of QA Plan and Approach for the Provider Payroll Project
Initial Quality Assurance Assessment	Phase 1	10/05/07	Initial QA Assessment of the Provider Payroll Project
Monthly Quality Assurance Assessment Reports	N/A	11/06/07 12/05/07 01/02/08 02/01/08 03/07/08 04/01/08	Monthly assessment of Provider Payroll Project by SysTest Labs QA Manager. The report is due the 5th business day of the month.
QA Findings Tracking Log	N/A	10/05/07 11/06/07 12/05/07 01/02/08 02/01/08 03/07/08 04/01/08	Log containing all QA findings and recommendations. Managed by the SysTest Labs QA Manager. The log is due the 5th business day of the month.
QA Monthly Debriefing	N/A	10/23/07 11/16/07 12/06/07 01/03/08 02/20/08 03/13/08 04/02/08	Monthly presentation to ESC detailing QA assessment of the project status
Assessment of Feasibility Study*	Phase 1	01/02/08	QA Assessment of the final Feasibility Study to be included in the monthly QA Assessment report
Assessment of Planned Procurement Strategy *	Phase 2	Phase 2	Optional QA Assessment of the processes, methodologies, and deliverables related to the Procurement and Approval Preparation process. Requirement is based on Provider Payroll Project Manager request and is dependent upon the outcome of the Feasibility Study
Assessment of Procurement Solution/Service*	Phase 3	Phase 3	Optional QA Assessment of the processes, methodologies, and deliverables related to the Procurement of the Solution and/or Service and obtaining Approvals process. Requirement is based on Provider Payroll Project Manager request and is dependent upon the outcome of the Feasibility Study
Verification of Planned Procurement Strategy	Phase 2	Phase 2	Optional IV&V written report produced as part of the review of the planned procurement strategy

SysTest
labs®

Deliverable	Phase Due	Scheduled/Actual Completion	Description
Assessment of Procurement Preparation Process and Contents of RFP	Phase 3	Phase 3	Optional IV&V written report documenting the evaluation of the procurement processes.

* Included in the Monthly Quality Assurance Assessment Report

Appendix D. PROJECT DOCUMENT REVIEWS

Table 12. Project Documents Reviewed by QA During Reporting Period

Document Name	Document Date	Document Author	Purpose Of The Document
Provider Payroll Project Status Report	03/05/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager - Jacqui Boydston	Monthly project status report forwarded to the Executive Steering Committee and Core Team.
PMO RFQQ Draft	03/05/08	Deputy CIO – Sue Langen	Request for Qualifications and Quotes to solicit proposals from vendors interested in providing project management, project planning, lead technical analyst and lead business analyst duties during the RFP, procurement, and implementation phases of the project.
Provider Payroll Project Core Team Meeting Agenda	03/10/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager – Jacqui Boydston	Agenda for the Project Core Team meetings held every two weeks.
Provider Payroll Project Core Team Meeting Minutes	03/11/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager – Jacqui Boydston	Minutes from the Core Team meeting displaying each agenda item, the outcome of the discussion, and the resulting action items.
Provider Payroll Project ESC Meeting Agenda	03/13/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager - Jacqui Boydston	Agenda for the Executive Steering Committee meetings held every three weeks.
Change Request 001	03/13/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager – Jacqui Boydston	Change request seeking approval to modify the scope and schedule of the Feasibility Study project
Project Schedule	03/13/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager – Jacqui Boydston	Project Schedule for Provider Payroll Project Through RFP Phase. The document has been re-baselined for Phase 2 timeline revisions.
Provider Payroll Project ESC Meeting Minutes	03/17/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager – Jacqui Boydston	Minutes from the Executive Steering Committee meeting displaying each agenda item, the outcome of the discussion, and the resulting action items.
Project Risk Log	03/17/08	Provider Payroll Project Manager – Jacqui Boydston	Risk Management Tracking Log maintained by Provider Payroll Project Manager. Used as input to weekly Project Status Report.

SysTest
labs®

4/2/2008
Document Number SL-010-040208
This material is confidential and proprietary to SysTest Labs and may not be distributed outside of the *Washington State Provider Payroll* engagement.
Page 26 of 27

Appendix E. PROJECT MEETING ATTENDANCE

Table 13. Project Meetings Attended by QA During Reporting Period.
Red text denotes cancelled meetings.

Meeting	Meeting Date	Meeting organizer	Purpose Of The Meeting
Executive Steering Committee Meeting	03/13/08		Meeting with Executive Steering Committee members for the purpose of project updates; reports on issues, concerns, and risks; and discussion and decisions on issues requiring ESC approval.
Core Team Meeting	03/10/08 03/24/08		Bi-weekly meeting with Core Team members for the purpose of project updates, communications with the ESC, reports and discussion concerning project issues, concerns, and risks.\n\nThe meeting scheduled for 3/24/08 was cancelled by the Provider Payroll Project Manager.
QA/PM Synch Meeting	03/05/08 03/12/08 03/19/08 03/26/08		Weekly synchronization meeting with Provider Payroll Project Manager to conduct assessment interviews, review the Findings and Recommendations Log, and discuss any pertinent project details as requested by Provider Payroll Project Manager.\n\nThe meetings scheduled for 3/19/08 was cancelled as the QA Manager was out of the office.

SysTest
labs®

Document Number SL-010-040208